

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed March 26, 2008, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 and 28-78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Applicants have amended claims 1, 17, 29, 45, 52, and 68. No new matter has been added. Applicants have also canceled claims 28 and 76-78 rendering the rejection of these claims moot. Applicants submit that claims 1-23 and 29-75 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request notice to this effect.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 12-15, 18-22, 29-35, 37, 40-43, 46-50, and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,950,198 (“Berarducci”), U.S. Patent No. 6,914,626 (“Squibbs”), and U.S. Patent No. 6,943,825 (“Silvester”) (“the first combination”). The Examiner rejected claims 52-58, 60, 63-66, and 69-73 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Berarducci, Squibbs, and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0143762 (“Boyd”) (“the second combination”). The remaining dependent claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious in view of one of the first and second combinations and one of U.S. Patent No. 6,977,679 (“Tretter”), U.S. Patent No. 7,100,190 (“Johnson”), U.S. Patent No. 6,965,828 (“Pollard”), and U.S. Patent No. 7,135,994 (“Kamikawa”).

As amended, independent claims 1, 29, and 52 include the subject matter of dependent claims 17, 45, and 68, respectively. The claimed methods of storing photographs now include providing users with route guidance for traveling to locations shown in selected digital photographs. The Examiner cites to Kamikawa for this teaching. (Office Action, pages 9, 16, and 23-24.)

Kamikawa describes overlaying real images (e.g., satellite photographs and aerial photographs) over a map display. (See, e.g., Kamikawa, Abstract.) For example, real images of

facilities, such as schools and parks, are displayed in areas of a map image corresponding to the facilities. (See, e.g., Kamikawa, col. 8, lines 46-59 and Figure 6.) As a result, a user viewing the display can more easily comprehend the surroundings of the user's current position than when the user is viewing only map images or only photographic images. (See, e.g., Kamikawa, col. 1, lines 17-60.)

Kamikawa does not describe providing route guidance to a location shown in a photographic image. Instead, Kamikawa describes obtaining and displaying a route based on a vehicle's current position and destination information obtained from a switch signal output of a joystick or a button switch. (Kamikawa, col. 8, lines 1-12.) Because Kamikawa's photographic images are used to enhance a display, Kamikawa does not suggest that the user selects a photographic image for routing. Accordingly, Applicants believe that Kamikawa does not show or suggest providing users with route guidance for traveling to locations shown in the selected digital photographs. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1-27 and 29-75 are not obvious in view of the first or second combination and Kamikawa.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests notice to this effect. The Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' representative below if any questions arise or she may be of assistance to the Examiner.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 18, 2008

By: Lisa M. Schoedel
Lisa M. Schoedel
Reg. No. 53,564
Patent Counsel

NAVTEQ North America, LLC
425 West Randolph Street, Suite 1200
Chicago, IL 60606
312-894-7351